

### REMARKS

The Examiner's helpful suggestion about claim 18 has been adopted. While it is believed that the criticisms of claims 1, 7 and 16 were not justified, those claims have been amended above without diminishing their scope. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. Section 112 can be withdrawn.

It is noted with appreciation that there is no art rejection of claims 1-15.

Claims 16-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Callahan or Malinofsky or Sanchez. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The method of the rejected claims concern manufacturing a calcined barium titanate by having a combination of (a) titanium dioxide powder particles having a barium compound on their surfaces and (b) a barium compound powder, and calcining the provided powder mixture. As pointed out in the present application, the prior art calcined a mixture of a barium compound and titanium dioxide which did not have the barium compound on its surface. The Callahan, Malinofsky and Sanchez references do no more than confirm what the application acknowledges as the prior art. The Office Action speculates that the same product would be achieved since there would be barium compound contacting the titanium dioxide at some point during the disclosed process. However, the Comparative Examples on pages 8-9 of this application demonstrate that the speculation is wrong and a different product is achieved. The speculation in the Office Action coupled with the Comparative Examples also establish that the result of the instant process was not predictable. Accordingly, the claimed method is not obvious.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: October 12, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Edward A. Meilman/

Edward A. Meilman

Registration No.: 24,735

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas

41st Floor

New York, New York 10036-2714

(212) 277-6500

Attorney for Applicant